

3715

Social Progress



It Is for Humanity to Decide . . . PITIRIM A. SOROKIN

Coalition for Peace . . . HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG

JANUARY 1949

Social Progress

DIVISION OF SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION

PAUL NEWTON POLING, Secretary and Editor; MARGARET E. KUHN, Assistant Editor; CLIFFORD EARLE, Associate Secretary; FERN M. COLBORN, Assistant Secretary; and WILLIAM H. MCCONAGHY, Director, and JESSE BELMONT BARBER, Associate Director of the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations.

CONTENTS : JANUARY, 1949

Articles	PAGE
It Is for Humanity to Decide, by <i>Pitirim A. Sorokin</i>	1
Christian Policy in the Making, by <i>Margaret E. Kuhn</i>	6
Fourteen Months of the Taft-Hartley Act, by <i>Alfred Hoffman</i>	10
Coalition for Peace, by <i>Hamilton Fish Armstrong</i>	14
 Editorial Comment	
An Appeal to Faith.....	16
 Christian Action	23
 Sanctuary	28
 About Books	30

Articles represent the opinions of the authors, and not the official policy of the Division of Social Education and Action or the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Published monthly, except July and August, by the Division of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan Street, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, \$1.00 a year; three years for \$2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request. Copyright 1948 by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

IT IS FOR HUMANITY TO DECIDE

By PITIRIM A. SOROKIN, professor of sociology at Harvard University. From an address given at the conference on Christian Policy sponsored by the Division of Social Education and Action in New York on November 19, 1948.

BLEEDING from war wounds and frightened by the atomic Frankenstein of destruction, humanity is desperately looking for a way out of the deathtrap. It craves life instead of inglorious death. It wants peace in place of war. It is hungry for love in lieu of hate.

Among the most popular plans for eliminating war and for establishing lasting peace are political prescriptions. Among these the most popular is democracy. A host of statesmen and scholars, business leaders, ministers, and plain men and women are convinced that a republican and democratic system of government guarantees peace and eliminates war. Another fashionable type of political alleged cure for war is the United Nations. In the last few years the belief in this remedy has grown rapidly, and at the present time, in the opinion of millions, the United Nations is the only cure for war and the only hope for a lasting peace.

In our economically minded age various economic cures for war are as popular as the political ones. Among these a restoration of the capitalist economy of "free enter-

prise" is regarded by many as a sure antidote for war and a builder of peace. But this capitalist culture is responsible to a great extent for the degradation of man himself. It turns persons into mere commodities in a competitive labor market. Out of medieval artisans it created proletarians, mere marketable robots, condemned to sell their labor and at the same time doomed to perpetual insecurity.

In our credulous age the most potent panacea for war is held by many to be education, in the sense of literacy, schooling, science, and technological inventions. The more rapidly they increase, the sooner will peace be assured. Such is the almost universal belief of contemporary humanity, from university presidents and professors, engineers and inventors, to the illiterate bushman dazzled by the miracles of science and technology.

If education had been purely constructive, if science and technology had served only the God of creation and not the mammon of destruction, if their fruits had not been misused, they might have constituted a potent remedy. Unfortunately school edu-

cation has contained within itself many a destructive element. It has all too frequently been a mere superficial veneer, making neither for true intelligence nor for ennoblement of character. Science and technology have created not only beneficial inventions but also the most destructive devices for mass murder and for the extermination of cultural values.

But all these so-called cures and plans ignore the fact that our present culture and social institutions generate mainly egoistic forces of war and other forms of strife, that they produce predominantly selfish, uncreative personalities. Therefore they require a radical change if we desire a peaceful, harmonious, co-operative, and creative social order—indeed, if humanity is to survive.

War destroys values precious to us—democracy, liberty of conscience, freedom. We fought one war to make the world safe for democracy. Yet where are the democracies today? Peace is not just around the corner. Wars, chaos, revolutions, strikes are to be expected, as long as the roots of this disintegrating cultural system are not replaced by a new root—partly rational, partly supersensory—which does not reduce life to mere sensory terms. We removed the Kaiser and thought all would be well with the world, but we got Hitler. If we were to get rid of Stalin tomorrow, some other dic-

tator would arise. For all of our social institutions belong to the old materialistic order; and to make shift to the new order requires a complete remodeling of all institutions and reorganization of the motives of men, away from power, popularity, and material wealth toward altruism, love, co-operation. We must eliminate precisely those elements of our contemporary culture which breed wars, hatred, and other ultimately suicidal tendencies.

If another war would come, there would be no victor. We in America are in large measure responsible for the international tension, for we created the situation. Ours is the chance of human history to do something constructive, not to export guns, not to support totalitarian regimes in Greece and China. But how opposite our course has been! We are benefactors, yes, but lusting for power as we bestow our bounty. Our present foreign policy leads only to war. It avoids war only if we can beat Russia to submission under our big stick.

For the Church to declare war on Communism is to disclaim the principles of Christ. Civil wars and strikes cannot be ascribed to the Politburo. They are homemade products, engendered by our culture.

If we want the Christian religion to be revived, we have to return to the heroes of the Early Church, the Christians of the first century who

were not identified with the Roman eagle or with concessions to Caesar. Tragic times call for heroic effort.

Our task in these times is to make the change from one cultural order to another as painless and swift as possible. This does not mean change from democracy to autocracy, from free enterprise to Communism, but from one dominant system of life and its major social institutions to a new sociocultural order—a revolution of the minds and hearts of individuals and groups as great as any in human history.

A major culture with its social institutions is not just a conglomeration of differing and unrelated cultural and social phenomena, but in its greater and most important part it represents a unity or major system whose components are permeated by the same fundamental principle and articulate the same basic value. In such a culture the dominant part of its fine arts, science, philosophy, and religion, its family mores, its mentality and way of life, each articulate one basic principle and value. For this reason the important parts are also interdependent: if one important part changes, the rest are bound to be similarly transformed.

In Western medieval culture, for instance, its major principle, or the true-reality value, was God. Its architecture and sculpture were the "Bible in Stone." Its literature was religious and Christian through and through. Its painting articulated the

same Bible in line and color. Its music was almost exclusively religious. Philosophy and theology were the queens of learning. Dominant mores, ways of life, and mental outlook stressed the union with God as the only supreme end, and a negative or indifferent attitude toward this sensory world, with all its wealth and pleasures. The medieval culture was a unified system, whose parts articulated the supreme principle: an infinite, supersensory, and supernatural God is the Creator of the world and of man.

The decline of medieval culture consisted of the disintegration of this ideational system. Beginning at the end of the twelfth century and becoming dominant at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the modern form of our culture emerged, "this worldly" and sensate, integrated around this new principle value: the true reality and value is sensory. Only what we see, hear, smell, touch, and otherwise perceive through our sense organs is real and has value.

Without hypocrisy or self-deceit every individual can have some influence in effecting this change, and can begin to work upon himself, developing his own creativeness and altruism. As a parent one can produce a vast number of beneficial or harmful effects according to the nature of the care of one's children and the management of the family. As a scientist, one can discover either constructive or destructive

forces. As an artist, writer, teacher, preacher, or politician, one can produce vulgarizing trash, debasing plays or novels, demoralizing sermons, unjust legislation, and the like—none of our actions are lost; each has its constructive or destructive consequences!

The second and third lines of attack consist in a well-planned modification of our culture and social institutions through the concerted actions of individuals united in groups which, in turn, are merged into larger federations or associations. At the present their tasks are twofold: first, to increase our knowledge and wisdom and to invent better techniques for rendering human beings more noble and altruistic; and, secondly, through this increased knowledge and these perfected techniques to draw up more adequate plans for the total process of change, to diffuse and propagate them, and to convince ever larger sections of humanity of the urgency, feasibility, and adequacy of the proposed reconstruction.

To be sure, the process of transformation will require considerable time. Now and then it will evolve according to plan; now and then in an unforeseen manner. Now it will move smoothly, now erratically, with many mistakes, deviations, and miscarriages. It is bound to be marked by conflicts, struggles, and crises.

Our first hope lies in the past

experience of mankind. Grave crises have happened many times in its history. However desperate the situation was, however hopeless it looked on the surface, humanity, that is, its best elements, has always been able to mobilize its mental, moral, and social forces to meet the crisis and to inaugurate a new constructive phase of its history. Hence there is no certain evidence that humanity cannot once again work out its salvation and that another renaissance is impossible.

Secondly, a shift from the decadent sensate type of culture and society to an idealistic or ideational form has occurred several times in the past. There is accordingly no reason to believe that it cannot recur in the future.

Thirdly, however numerous and grave may have been the mistakes of humanity in choosing wrong leaders and methods for coping with past catastrophes, after many trials and errors, in the final moment of the crisis, it has generally been able to choose the right path, sound plans, and capable leaders to follow until the danger was over. There is no reason to believe that this cannot happen again.

An attentive observer can already notice signs of the declining influence of false prophets, wrong leaders, and empty values. Partly rationally and partly superconsciously an ever-increasing proportion of humanity is beginning to

follow the difficult road that leads to salvation.

Fourthly, the replacement of the old by the new is greatly assisted by the historical process itself, by the vast, impersonal, spontaneous forces that animate it, and especially by the superconscious energies released by the crisis.

Not in the classroom but in the hard school of experience people are being constantly taught by these impersonal forces an unforgettable and indelible lesson, comprehensible to the simplest mind, that the existing order has passed its creative phase and is on the verge of bankruptcy; that it spells bullets rather than prosperity, regimentation rather than freedom; confusion rather than order; death rather than life. Its decline is not due to the murderous assault of barbarians, revolutionaries, or plotters, but to its own senility, the exhaustion of its creative forces. The decline is not a case of murder but of disintegration. These impersonal forces continue to drive humanity farther and farther along the road from the old to the new.

Still more important is the role of the superconscious forces released by the crisis itself. Almost every true conversion (as a sudden transformation of the personality and conduct of a sinful person into those of a saint, of an egoist into a creative

altruist) has been precipitated by the impact of some crisis or calamity. The same is true of a considerable proportion of creative geniuses in the arts and sciences and other fields. In many cases the initial impulse has been illness. Others were impelled by some painful shock, the loss of dear ones, the crumbling of their ambitions, persecution, or the suffering incident to such calamities as war, revolution, and plague.

Similar, though more temporary, conversions are regularly experienced by thousands when their city or community is suddenly stricken by calamity.

The prolonged crises that seemingly await humanity in the near future are likely to produce a further release of these forces and markedly intensify their actual kinetic power. Transforming their potential forces into kinetic forces, these creative energies are likely to assume control of the vast anonymous forces of the historical process itself, unconscious and conscious, using them for constructive purposes. What has occurred thousands of times in individual conversions and in those of groups and nations may happen to the whole of humanity: the process may be effected in the comparatively short space of a few decades instead of requiring centuries. The existing order is doomed. It is for humanity itself to decide its destiny!

CHRISTIAN POLICY IN THE MAKING

A Report of a Study Conference on Christian Policy

A GROUP of thoughtful Presbyterian leaders concerned about the continuing world crisis and important decisions that must be reached if the world is "to be made safe for humanity" met in New York on November 19, 1948, in a study conference on Christian Policy sponsored by the Division of Social Education and Action.

Realizing the urgent need for a united Christian policy in facing domestic and foreign issues, the Division brought together leaders who represented varied points of view in approaching these issues. The threefold purpose of the meeting was: to reach some agreement about these disputed fields of social and political conflict; to achieve a sense of mutual support as Christian citizens in effecting Christian solutions of these problems; and to plan study materials that will equip adults and young people in our local churches to take Christian social action. This study conference was in preparation for twenty interdenominational regional conferences, which are to be held in the spring, following the study conference sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches in Cincinnati, Ohio, in March. These regional conferences are to be continued until the entire country has been covered;

and their purpose will be to activate study and social action groups in churches throughout the nation.

The study conference on Christian Policy opened with worship led by Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City. He spoke of the need for an enlarged vision on the part of Christians, and of a planetary rather than parochial approach to the new era struggling to be born. He reminded the group of the supremacy of the spiritual factors of life and our urgent task of fashioning the minds and spirits of men in one of the heroic periods of human history when human life is in flux and the nations of the world are in a plastic state. He urged the increased participation of lay men and women in our churches. Too often the people who are recognized leaders in the life of this nation in industry, in education, and in politics are hesitant and apologetic about exerting leadership in religious affairs.

Time and a crowded conference schedule cut short much of the hoped-for discussion by members of the group, so that the values of group thinking were not fully realized. Limited discussion did reveal agreement on two important concerns that were the recurring themes

of every speaker's presentation: That we live in a revolutionary age of many, not one, revolutionary movements.

That we must look to mankind's spiritual regeneration and the reorganization of human motives, if we are to survive and change from the old order to the new.

In the morning session of the conference the group examined the pronouncements of the first assembly of the World Council of Churches and the message of Amsterdam to the churches of America. Dr. Roswell P. Barnes, Associate General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, helped the group to appreciate the importance of the existence of the World Council of Churches as an instrument for resolving tension, for exchanging ideas and opinions, for working through differences to common goals and Christian comradeship.

There was marked contrast between the physical exhaustion of Europe and her resources and America's relatively unexpended resources of human energy, material wealth, and technical development. Europeans suffered also from psychological and emotional exhaustion as a result of long exposure to fear, bombings, death. The hopes for security and peace that had carried people through the war years have not been fulfilled; and the frustration of these hopes because of failure to adjust political dif-

ferences between the nations has brought spiritual exhaustion and discouragement.

Amsterdam discussions were also colored by the fact that there has been a shift in the location of power in international affairs away from Britain, France, and Germany to America and Russia.

Amsterdam revealed a conflict in the approach of Europeans and Americans to the cold war between East and West. We Americans seem to have been preoccupied primarily with such political civil rights as the secret ballot, freedom of assembly and the press, while European nations have been primarily concerned with "keeping alive." In their struggle for bread, shelter, and the minimums of survival, social and economic rights are most important and our American political freedom is a luxury. This fact leads Europeans to think that Communism speaks more directly than Western democracy to human needs.

Then too our American attitude toward Russia and Communism differs from the attitude of other countries. We have put our best national idealism into our hopes for a permanent peace and we resent Russia's frustration of our most idealistic national ambitions for the success of the United Nations.

Organization of the World Council of Churches was further complicated by procedural difficulties. Drafting committees which were set

up with international, interracial, and interfaith representation worked under almost unsurmountable odds of deadlines, language barriers, differences of attitudes about committee functions, and widely different levels of conference experience. But, most important of all, Amsterdam demonstrated that people with differences can learn to live together on the basis of common loyalties.

In the summary of the morning session, by Dr. Joseph Haroutunian, professor of theology at McCormick Seminary in Chicago, there was agreement about the importance of reconciling American and European concepts of Christianity and world order; also about the fact that Americans and Europeans suffer from the same spiritual sickness. America's illness, it was recognized, may be more dangerous because we don't know that we are sick. If we in America fail to understand the signs of the times; if we continue as though we are the only people who have the answers; if we draw lines between Europe and Russia and ourselves, we will not be spared from destruction.

In the afternoon session political economist Max Lerner, of the *New York Star* and the New School for Social Research, and sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, of Harvard University, presented their ideas on the world in crisis and possible methods for the reconstruction of humanity. Dr. Sorokin's appraisal of our dis-

ordered society appears on page 1 of this issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS. Dr. Lerner's analysis of the world situation and of America's part in determining its outcome included these important comments. (A full report of Dr. Lerner's address will appear in a later issue.)

The present impasse with Russia and the inexcusable blockade of Berlin are only parts of a larger problem. The Berlin situation is, in turn, only part of larger European problems, of the power of eastern Europe against the power of democratic-socialist western Europe, of the problem of ending the Franco regime in Spain.

Europe, then, is part of a still larger problem of the multiple revolutions of our time—a revolutionary movement as great as any in history.

This multiple revolution is also a colonial revolt of underdeveloped lands and depressed peoples from their Western masters. It shocks the foundations of colonial empires around the world, and the Russians are stepping in, getting a foothold.

We are also living in a period of moral revolution in which the hand that holds the atom bomb holds great potential for good and evil. It is controlled by a heart and mind that have not been changed, have not kept pace with the outward technological changes.

The deep conflicts between political systems will not be resolved by war. Neither power will win. The

resolution of the differences will come only by the choices made by the American people, by people in other nations. To compete with Russia for influence abroad, we not only must outproduce her, but demonstrate that we know how to use what we produce for the good of the people. It is not a matter of how many newspapers we have in America, or how many Americans read them, but of what the newspapers give the people to read. We can't castigate the police states in Europe and hunt dangerous thoughts at home. We can't influence and win over the nonwhite peoples of the world when we treat our own minorities as second-class citizens. The way we handle our own domes-

tic problems has world-wide effect.

Dr. Robert S. Hartman, professor of philosophy and ethics at Ohio State University summarized the closing session, and pointed out that the people have never made war. A Christian foreign policy would work to influence the Governments of the world to reflect the thinking and desires of the people, to meet their needs. We, as Christians, must infuse our Government with this deep humanitarian concern, for the more firmly we stand on our Christian principles, the more we shall gain the respect of the world. We must say "no" to every system that disregards human values, that fails to put the people first.

—Margaret E. Kuhn.

Christian Policy conference leaders: (left to right) Joseph Haroutunian, Walter Van Kirk, Pitirim A. Sorokin (seated), Robert S. Hartman, Max Lerner, James Smart (seated), Rollo C. La Porte.



FOURTEEN MONTHS OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

By ALFRED HOFFMAN, *First Vice-President, American Federation of Hosiery Workers.*

THE Taft-Hartley Amendments to the National Labor Relations Act have now been effective for some fourteen months. Experience during this period allows for only a partial appraisal of the law and its effects upon the labor movement. The majority of labor agreements effective in the United States were negotiated and concluded prior to June 21, 1947, so that a great many features legal under the original National Labor Relations Act have been carried forward under the amended act. In a number of important industrial groupings, neither employees nor employers desired any change from customary practices or procedures, therefore no sharp conflicts were registered. In other industries, as for example the graphic arts or printing industry, terms of the act have been used by the employers in an attempt to eliminate employment practices inherent in their industries, which have resulted in sharp conflict, very long strikes and litigation.

Partial appraisal of experience under the act is mandated by a combination of other factors. We have been going through a period of extremely high productivity, with a

rising cost of living, an inflationary price spiral, extremely healthy profits, and acute shortages in skilled labor groupings. Employers' associations have generally advised their members to proceed cautiously in using the several facets of the act designed to hamper and break down trade-union effectiveness in collective bargaining. Our economic picture during the past two years had much to do with this admonition to employers generally, but certainly political considerations also played their part. The outspoken opposition of organized labor to the act made the law one of the major campaign issues of the recent election. Labor bitterness toward the act has been felt in the election. Political campaigners favoring the act made a great point about the reduction in the number of strikes since the law was passed. But anyone familiar with the strike cycle in American economic life knows that the reduction in strikes would have occurred irrespective of any legislation, since by 1948 we had completed the conversion from war to peacetime production and all of the unrest, dislocations, uncertainties of the change-over were behind us.

American labor leaders who went through the "American Plan" drive of the early twenties following World War I are convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act is designed to accomplish the same purpose. They mistrust the broad powers vested in the General Council, particularly since the vague and ambiguous language of the act allows for such a wide range of interpretation. They are convinced that employers generally have proceeded with caution in the application of the act; and that full steam pressure upon labor will not be developed until a significant change in the economic picture occurs. Trade-unions expect to get their real "horse whipping" when prices and profits begin to drop, when unemployment replaces the present skilled labor shortages.

It took twelve long years of trial and error to define the rights of labor and management under the old National Labor Relations Act, and thousands of court decisions were needed to augment these policies. Many of these have been abandoned by the National Labor Relations Board under the amended act, and another welter of Board hearings and countless court suits will be required to clarify policies under the new act.

Union Security Elections

One of the most severe criticisms of the old National Labor Relations Board was the time factor involved

in the processing of certification elections, and unfair labor practice charges. The American Federation of Hosiery Workers has a case record showing innumerable certification elections that were delayed up to eight months, from the time the petition was filed to the election itself—a period long enough to wipe out the entire organizing process. Under the the present setup, the same delays are a matter of daily and deadly routine.

While Congress increased the budget of the National Labor Relations Board under the amended act, it also established a feature known as the union security election; and this secret election process required to authorize a union to sign a union maintenance clause or a union security clause represents 70 per cent of the case load of the Board today. Some 17,700 such elections have been handled by the Board during its first 12 months of operation, and in 98 per cent of the elections, such authority has been given by employees. This clause was written in to protect the poor defenseless union member from the domination of the labor boss; but I have contended for twenty-five years that the fundamental pressure for the closed shop and the union shop has come from the rank-and-file union members who resented and mistrusted the "free riders." Most unions in this country were operating under some form of mem-

bership maintenance under contracts. Many had the union shop, and only a few had closed shop. This is particularly true since 1936. However, one beneficial effect of the union security election has been the demand by unions authorized to negotiate such clauses for the maximum allowed by the law, or union membership after thirty days of employment. Many unions had historically given new employees from sixty to one hundred and twenty days in which to join under union-shop agreements. The framers themselves are willing to change this part.

Sponsors of the act have emphatically stated that while they want to eliminate the closed shop, they have no intention of regulating or restraining the internal administration of union affairs. Under the union security provisions of the act, employers can discharge an employee legally at the request of a union for only one reason—the failure to pay uniform and non-discriminatory membership dues. Whether the failure to pay non-discriminatory fines or uniform assessments is legal grounds for discharge is highly debatable at the moment and will require court decision to clarify. At this point the act does interfere with the administration of internal union affairs.

Then too every trade-union constitution provides clearly written procedures for filing charges against members, officers, or agents, trials

and their conduct, and appeals from trial bodies. Most unions allow three and four avenues of appeal. Every union operates with a partially written and partially well understood system of ethics and mores generally accepted by the membership and containing a greater spirit of brotherhood than can be found in the average Christian church. The violation of these ethics and mores is a serious matter. Under the union security provisions of the act, a union member may be expelled for committing the most heinous and offensive crimes against common decency and ethics, and still be left in a position in which other workers are forced to associate with him.

The decertification election is another instrument aimed to protect union members from domination by labor leaders. Such elections can be secured by petition signed by 30 per cent of the workers in a plant, and would seem to be a very decent procedure. As a matter of fact, they have been misused by managements who have wanted to sever union connections after having reluctantly signed contracts with properly certified unions—as an “easy divorce” in one year after the wedding. The old act offered ample opportunity for workers to drop an unsatisfactory bargaining representative. The bargaining status of a union could be challenged also by the employer, by competing unions at yearly inter-

vals. The decertification machinery will get wide use during the next few years; indications point to an employer offensive in that direction.

Fundamental Labor Right Undermined

Organized and unorganized labor has only one real weapon in the economic arena, the withdrawal of its services, or the strike. This weapon is seldom lightly used and is resorted to as a last-ditch stand. A recent decision of the NLRB cuts at the very heart of labor's strike weapon without offering any substitutes for the strike. This decision denies to economic strikers—those who strike for any other reason except in protest to unfair labor practices—the right to vote in a certification or decertification election, even where such strikers have been permanently replaced by strikebreakers, and where strikers have been notified that their services will be ended with the company involved unless they return to work by a certain date. This decision makes it imperative for economic strikers to keep a plant from operating; they will be “washed up” if a plant can secure replacements. My experience with labor relations in the twenties and early thirties convinces me that there will be a rebirth of bitter violence as time goes on, despite the fact that the act is very specific in respect to picketing and coercion.

Other infringements upon the Constitutional rights of workers are

a part of the new act—too many for analysis here. Neither the organization I represent nor I as an individual have ever objected to certain requirements of the act because we have always felt that good trade-union practice made these things desirable. On the other hand, we are all concerned with those factors which are fundamental to the life of the trade-union—its continued economic bargaining position and its purpose for existence. These have been and will continue to be attacked by the terms of the new law. It is quite possible that further restrictive amendments would have been nailed to the present thoroughly disreputable piece of legislation had the result of the recent election been different. We may secure clarification of some of the confused points during the next twelve to twenty years and after millions of dollars have been spent in the courts, unless the act is further amended or repealed.

If another long depression comes while this legislation exists, only a handful of bankrupt ineffective trade-unions will survive. But we will have the largest Communist party membership outside of Russia. It must be remembered that the American trade-union is fundamentally a reform organization which fully accepts capitalism as we know it here. When reform organizations fail or are made ineffective, the revolutionary organization is its natural successor.

COALITION FOR PEACE

By HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG, *editor of Foreign Affairs.*

FROM the time of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, overenthusiastic advocates of the United Nations emphasized its function as a guarantee of peace and failed to explain that if the guarantee were ever to be reliable the organization would have to develop the opposite and much less palatable function—it would have to fit itself to make war. Actually, of course, the Charter not only specifically authorized wars against aggression but pledged members to take part in them. Its authors did not expect that the long shadow in which mankind has always lived could be obliterated at one stroke, but hoped that it might be reduced. They therefore did not “outlaw” war as such, but tried to arrange that any future aggressive force which might appear would be inferior in strength to forces already assembled to deal with it.

The present risk of war, however, comes not so much from the possibility that the Charter must be enforced as from the lack of means to enforce it. The work of the Security Council, which must make decisions involving enforcement, has been stalemated by the Soviet Union’s abuse of the veto. So has the work of its two all-important committees, the Military Staff Com-

mittee and the Atomic Energy Commission, which has failed to find a way to regulate the production of fissionable materials to satisfy the Western requirement for airtight international controls and the Soviet requirement that controls must not violate the secrecy veiling all the operations of a police state.

If a showdown comes under present conditions, loyal members of the United Nations will find themselves no better able to carry out their agreement to meet force with force than members of the League of Nations were able to deal with Japan’s aggression in Manchuria, Mussolini’s aggression in Ethiopia, or Hitler’s aggression in Poland.

At San Francisco one heard it said often that the United Nations could not survive defiance by one of the Great Powers; the machinery of the organization would grind to a stop and the whole fabric would crumble to pieces. Americans who helped draft a charter that gave the veto to nations bearing the main responsibility for enforcement did not ignore this possibility; but they also knew the hazards of going too far in curtailing sovereignty, given the need of getting the measure both accepted (here Wilson’s 1919 failure counted heavily) and lived up to.

When the Roosevelt Administration began studying international organization problems intensively in 1942, it assumed that the veto should apply only to decisions involving the use of force or leading directly to the use of force.

Modified Idea About the Veto

Since then, world relationships have steadily deteriorated. Efforts to solve the major postwar problems by a process of negotiation and compromise have failed. In view of this, American officials and Congressional leaders like Senator Vandenberg have modified their ideas about the effect on national interests and national safety of some of the most rigid shibboleths of national sovereignty. Today the United States is on record as wishing to free the whole procedure of Chapter VI from the veto and as seeking some practicable way to mitigate the absolute right of veto even in connection with decisions involving force. For example, the American delegation at Lake Success has favored a program of forceful sanctions, free from possibility of veto, against violators of atomic warfare controls.

Yet even at San Francisco there was an answer to the criticism of the smaller nations (and of many individuals) that the Great Power veto condemned the United Nations to futility in precisely the most dangerous crises. For even if a Great Power did wreck the United Nations

as a formal organization by committing or protecting aggression and then taking cover behind the veto, there would remain a group of members who presumably would not forget their obligations simply because the prescribed method of carrying them out had been blocked. In looking about for an alternative method too, they would find themselves substantially better off than members of the old League of Nations had been in the life-and-death crises at Geneva. For they would have not only a political coordinating organ, the Secretariat; they would also possess what the League did not, a military planning organ—the Military Staff Committee—and it would have assembled in advance the elements of a powerful international police force. This force would be ready for use, though minus, of course, the contingent promised by the aggressor. No one would expect it to be able to deal conclusively, by itself, with the full forces of the aggressor. But it would be prepared for the first phase of hostilities, which the new weapons have made crucial; and it would commit the nations represented to the use of their full forces as the struggle progressed.

One reason why the present situation is so dangerous is that although in theory the faithful U N members might form a coalition in a crisis of the sort described, they do

(Continued on page 18)

NEW STAFF MEMBER



Miss Margaret E. Kuhn joined the staff of the Division of Social Education and Action on October 15 as Assistant Editor of *SOCIAL PROGRESS* and publications. Miss Kuhn's responsibility will also include appearances before church groups and teaching assignments with summer leadership training schools.

Since her graduation from Flora Mather College of Western Reserve University, Miss Kuhn has contributed guidance to the solution of social issues and community problems. Her first position was with the staff of the Cleveland Y. W. C. A. This was followed by eleven years with the Germantown Y. W. C. A. in Philadelphia. She was called to the U. S. O. staff of the National Board of Y. W. C. A. in 1941 and was Publications Editor for six years, where she had a part in the development of interfaith and interracial programs.

Before coming to her new position, Miss Kuhn served a year as Editor of the *Alliance World* and Public Relations and Program Consultant of the General Alliance of Unitarian Women in Boston, Massachusetts.

Miss Kuhn is a member of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. We are grateful to announce the coming of one so gifted in this field.

"DON'T SURRENDER THE PEACE"

THE Draft Act of 1948 is due to expire in May, 1949. Repeal of the draft by the action of the House and the Senate with approval by the President is more than can be secured now even with the election of the new Congress and the consequent improved position vis-à-vis the draft. It therefore appears our best course in support of the General Assembly Pronouncement to confine our efforts to opposition to the extension of the Draft Act and any attempt to pass a universal military training bill.

Issues of the *Kiplinger News Letter* (October 9, 16) report that at present "the trend is toward semi-war economy, a sort of 'garrison state.' Next on the program is the arming of Europe by United States lend-lease. . . .

to Faith

This will start early next year, on top of the bigger defense and E. C. A. The country as yet is not aware of this, for it is semi-secret. . . . It will require sacrifices on the part of the public . . . akin to wartime. To cultivate sentiment for the military, plans are being made to invite to Washington some small groups of influential public leaders, to meet the generals, the admirals, the diplomats, and hear them talk, just military 'education.'"

This program of military "education" at the taxpayers' expense exerts an enormous pressure in molding public opinion. It will require hard thinking and courageous action if the military leaders are denied their objective and we escape the draft and progressive militarization of the nation. The growing trust in armaments, balances of power, and regional alliances indicate that we have not broken with our fatal devotion to measures that have regularly plunged us into disastrous wars.

The propaganda for "national defense" and our mounting preparations for war undercut the world's hope and our own faith in our ability to make secure the uneasy peace we now have. It is an appalling fact that many advocates of a "strong national defense program" and regional alliances regard (though with such reluctance they will hardly confess it to themselves) another war as practically inevitable. This surrender of the peace in the atomic age, if it prevails, would be the most fateful decision ever made. For what surrender in war or peace ever brought greater evil on mankind than the destruction we are promised in the next—the atomic war. We must not surrender the peace especially in our thinking, for "wars begin in the minds of men," and it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.

NO PLACE TO HIDE, by David Bradley, is a particularly important contribution to the books on world peace. The inadequacy of unilateral armaments, regional alliances, balances of power was boldly declared by General McArthur in Tokyo Bay. Our search for world security must not commit us to the old ways that have led to war, for we have had our last chance. The article by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, "Coalition for Peace," offers a program for security under the United Nations which makes sense in this atomic age. It is a good companion piece to David Bradley's valuable book.

—Paul Newton Poling.

Coalition for Peace

(Continued from page 15)

not have the encouragement of possessing ready instruments for action and the potential aggressor does not have the discouragement of knowing that they possess them.

Collective Action Against Aggressors

A constructive course, it seems to me, would be for members who are unhappy over the deficiencies of the present U N procedure to undertake that they themselves will carry out the obligation to resist aggression even beyond the point when a veto prevents the Security Council from telling them that they must. This "coalition for peace" will be open to all members; but only those who are willing to prepare seriously for collective action against aggression will join.

Those who wish to form the coalition for peace find all the encouragement and authority they need in Article 51 of the Charter, which states that members retain their inherent right to act in self-defense, either individually or in groups, "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

They might make the commitment in one of two ways. A general protocol might be adopted, as sug-

gested above, open to all United Nations members. Signatories would register their willingness to participate in joint defensive action when, say, 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council, including 4 of the 5 permanent members, vote that aggression has occurred; and they would specify some simple procedure to supplement the Security Council procedure beyond that point. Alternatively, groups of members could work toward the same result by stages, in a series of regional treaties after the example of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947, and the west European security pact signed at Brussels on March 17, 1948.

Either method of supplementing the Charter machinery would be legal under Article 51 and within the spirit of the Charter as a whole. Significantly, however, Article 51 does not form part of Chapter VIII of the Charter, dealing with regional arrangements, but stands as the last article in Chapter VI, dealing with threats to the peace and acts of aggression. Its position there emphasizes its character as a sort of optional reinsurance clause for the protection of all members in case the enforcement measures set out in the preceding articles (including the preparation of military forces and of plans for using them) should fail.

The procedure could and should be extremely simple. The protocol would itself define the point at which its provisions would be brought into operation. The first could properly be done in the words of Article 51, quoted above, describing the emergency that would arise if the Security Council failed to act in face of armed attack on a member; the second could be done by providing that the protocol would become automatically operative when the specified Security Council majority had voted to act but had been thwarted by the veto. Or there might be agreement that when the stated conditions arise the signatories of the protocol shall at once be canvassed by one of the Great Powers, and as soon as a stipulated majority (say two thirds) has been found ready to act, all shall be bound to act. If a more deliberate method seemed advisable, the General Assembly or the Little Assembly (if it is continued) might be given the responsibility of deciding, when the Security Council reaches the roadblock, whether or not resort should be had to the protocol, and could be authorized to declare it in effect by a two thirds vote.

Regional Agreements Vs. General Pact Open to All Nations?

Many will feel that since there now exists a west European defense

organization as a result of the Brussels Pact of March 17, we shall naturally make it the basis for whatever supplementary security arrangements are called for by the deadlock in the United Nations and the growing tension with Russia. The Brussels Pact has indeed created a cohesive group with which to negotiate conveniently; it includes the two Great Powers that must form the basis for any defense scheme in western Europe; and it must have been in the minds of the sixty-four Senators who by voting for the Vandenberg Resolution on June 11, 1948, empowered the Administration to favor the "progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter," and our association with such of them "as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid" and affect our security.

Despite these apparent advantages, we should not decide as a matter of course that the Brussels Pact is the best starting point for accomplishing the long journey that lies ahead.

The Brussels Pact covers a number of fields in which the United States and many other nations will not wish to assume responsibility.

Further, the Brussels Pact omits many democratic European nations that are menaced by aggression,

among them some for whose safety the United States feels particular concern. There seems no legal reason, however, why states that are still outside the United Nations should not undertake voluntarily to live up to certain of the standards of membership.

The question is whether they would be more likely to want to do this in a regional agreement based on the Brussels Pact, which contains varied economic, commercial, and social obligations, or in a general underwriting of the Charter's mutual assistance obligations. My guess would be that in view of the prevailing desire not to offend Soviet Russia unduly they would choose the latter. Nations under the Soviet domination cannot at present be expected to join; but it would be an error for us to exclude them even by implication.

The Brussels Pact is a valuable achievement in itself, and signalizes a *rapprochement* among certain states which are a necessary part of a wider defense agreement. But from the American viewpoint, and in the eyes of various other states, including some that belong to it as well as some that do not, it does not provide a satisfactory basis for the additional security measures that the present world crisis seems to demand.

And what of Soviet Russia? One can imagine circumstances in which even against her will she would

choose to sign a protocol against aggression rather than face a period of lasting isolation. The chances of this happening under present conditions seem next to nil. All the more reason for us to do nothing that unnecessarily affronts her. And certainly we do not want to do anything that adds unnecessarily to the present disabilities of the United Nations. By stressing "unnecessarily" I do not mean that we should appease Soviet Russia by allowing the present condition of international unpreparedness to continue, or that we should maintain the roster of United Nations members at any price. But in deciding our action we should choose the course least open to proper Soviet objection and least likely to make her quit the United Nations entirely. She might, of course, do that in any event, whether or not we take any initiative. But if she resigned from the United Nations because we tried to make the Charter itself work, she would not only be placing herself on the losing side of a great moral debate but she would be repudiating her own attitude toward similar efforts to make the Covenant of the League of Nations work on the eve of the last war—efforts which her propagandists often recall in order to glorify Soviet consistency and heap scorn on other weaklings.

On March 17, 1936, Litvinov made one of his most impassioned addresses to the Assembly of the

League of Nations on behalf of effective collective security. In the preceding eighteen months Germany had violated the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty and Italy had invaded Ethiopia. Now Germany was violating the Locarno Pact. The Soviet Foreign Commissar said: "One cannot fight for the collective organization of security without taking collective measures against the violation of international obligations." And he concluded: "We believe that the true adherents of peace are entitled to submit their scheme for the organization of European peace no less than those who violate treaties. We are in favor of establishing the security of all peoples of Europe as against the half-peace which is not peace, but war."

Today Soviet Russia would probably find less to resent in a general pact against aggression than in a pact of west European nations supported by the United States. The general pact would be open to all, herself included, and would apply to situations in all parts of the world, not just to an area where she is suspected of aggressive designs. The west European pact, though purely and only defensive, could operate against nobody but herself, the only Great Power in a position to menace the area's independence.

Even broader considerations than those so far mentioned speak for a move to strengthen the United Nations as a whole rather than to

underwrite a group of its members. In the first place, the commitments of the United States under the Charter are general, not regional. Secondly, we should take advantage of the fact that we have a good cause—the best cause of all, peace—and that many nations everywhere may be expected to rally to it. Thirdly, the difficulty of defining a "region" in a way that will be satisfactory under varying world conditions is very great.

Protecting UN's Universal Character

It seems to me preferable to set standards of conduct rather than standards of geography. The United States is a world power, with worldwide interests. One of them is peace, which in the most primary terms of international organization means protection of the peaceful against aggression by the warlike. We should welcome as a partner any peace-loving state that is willing to assume and able to fulfill defense obligations on a reciprocal basis. Under the Charter we already have a responsibility for helping to protect states with such qualifications, wherever they may be situated. The only novelty would be that under the proposed underwriting agreement the obligation to execute this responsibility would come into operation when something less than all the members of the Security Council voted that it should.

The American people still have great hopes for the United Nations and want to do anything reasonable to make it a success. They might accept a plan to make the Charter fulfill its purposes even more willingly than they would agree to guarantee certain individual nations. The latter course is entirely legal under Article 51, and it would be much better for the United States to take it than to do nothing. But the general protocol would benefit the United Nations as a whole at the same time that it met the particular requirements of the situation in Europe. Even though certain nations held aloof, it still would protect the universal character of the United Nations; whereas a series of regional pacts might in time overshadow the organization's universal character and aims. The Vandenberg Resolution left the choice of methods open. It recalled the world-wide interests of the United States by reaffirming its unreserved devotion to the purposes, principles, and provisions of the Charter.

The ideal goal seems to me to be different from this [Brussels Pact, formation of other special groups with interlocking memberships], and no harder to attain. A general pact open to all United Nations members willing to accept its specific obligations, and entered into from the start by the most powerful members of the Brussels Pact and

the organization of American states, would achieve all that a limited security pact could achieve, and much more besides. It would be evidence that among some of the strongest members of the United Nations there was a new determination to make the Charter come alive in its full integrity. It would not merely underwrite the safety of those brave enough to risk something in order to gain more for themselves; the same act would underwrite the United Nations itself.

If as a matter of practical politics we find we can do no more, let us by all means help to form a series of special groupings for peace. And in that event let the first of these groups to receive our guarantee of help be composed of the democratic nations of western Europe which stand today in the shadow of a new aggression. But before we conclude that this must be our maximum effort let us see whether we cannot lay the basis for a coalition for peace that is potentially as wide as the membership of the United Nations. Let us not presume that only ill is concealed in "the giant mass of things to come." Our action today can be evidence of a hope that the full goal can be achieved ultimately, and perhaps the very reiteration of that hope can itself bring the day a little nearer. Here is a challenge worthy of the men who will write the next chapter in American foreign policy.

CHRISTIAN *Action*

WORKSHOP

BROTHERHOOD MONTH IN THE MAKING

If the month of February is to have significance in the realm of race relations for your church and community, plans and preparations must be made now. To delay means that the best dates will be taken by other interests, the most qualified speakers will already be engaged, and program-planning will be makeshift.

No Christian church can afford to pass up so splendid an opportunity as Brotherhood Month to demonstrate democratic human relations. The accusation facing us today is that racial barriers are in holy places. We can ill afford to allow secular agencies, sports teams, and a materialistic society to display better racial practices than the Christian Church. The mandate given the President by the people of this nation through the November election signifies their desire to resolve the American dilemma of high ideals and low behavior. Human rights are the birthright of all God's children and have been the foundation of our Protestant heritage.

Your Presbyterian Church through General Assembly calls upon you to make your church a steppingstone and not a stumbling block in better racial and cultural relations.

Brotherhood Month has been widely and successfully observed in many communities because of the leadership of the Christian Church. The process of planning these observances has often been as effective as the events themselves in fostering a meeting of minds and spirits—therefore,

• **Organize your Brotherhood Month committee now.** It should bring together representatives from each society,

and organization in the church, including young people and the church school. It is also desirable to include representatives from minority groups in your community so that the planning may be a practical expression of our basic belief that all men are brothers in the human family. The group can be convened by the minister, the session, or the committee on Social Education and Action. This committee should plan for church-wide activities, also draw up program suggestions for brotherhood observance by the various church groups.

• **Consult the packet of program materials** for the 27th Annual Observance of Race Relations Sunday (February 13) prepared by the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

• **Request that each organization in your church schedule at least one brotherhood event** in its February activities schedule, and be ready with a variety of ideas.

• **Urge the Men's Brotherhood to plan a Lincoln's Day dinner.** On the eve of the emancipator's birthday there is no more thrilling sight or experience than breaking bread and sharing fellowship with Jewish, Negro, and white participants.

• **Arrange attractive bulletin board displays** featuring race relations pamphlets and news clippings.

• **Prepare a lending library shelf** of brotherhood reading.

• **Organize a study course** and a series of five informal discussions based on the pamphlet *All One Body We*. (Available at Westminster Book Stores, 25 cents.)

• **Order the "KIT for use with study on Race and Cultural Relations,"** containing

latest source materials and a complete outline for church study and action in the field of race. (Prepared by the Division of Social Education and Action and available at Westminster Book Stores. 50 cents.)

• **Invite your minister to devote one Sunday morning service** to the consideration of the church and race relations, to share the pulpit with a guest minister from another race, to ask a rabbi to speak on Christian-Jewish relations.

• **Plan special music** on one Sunday of the month and invite the choir from a neighboring congregation to join with your choir; or arrange for an exchange of choirs.

• **Co-operate with church leaders of other denominations** and civic and social agencies in planning a community-wide brotherhood observance, with minority groups and other faiths represented.

Write Westminster Book Store for movies and film strips on civil rights and interfaith emphases. Order the movie *Brotherhood of Man*, based on the pamphlet *The Races of Mankind*, from the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations.

For special assistance and guidance in planning your Brotherhood Month activities write the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

—William H. McConaghy.

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC LIFE WEEK, JANUARY 16-22

The week of January 16-22 has been designated by the Federal Council of Churches for emphasis upon the church and economic life. The announced purpose of the week is "to develop an informed and active concern within the churches for Christian principles in economic life." The observance is designed to help individuals to understand their responsibility for what they do in economic activity—as buyers and sellers, employers and workers, investors, or members of a profession.

A leaflet prepared by the Department of the Church and Economic Life of the Federal Council explains the project and lists twenty-one program suggestions for local churches as well as study materials for individuals and groups. Copies can be secured from the Division of Social Education and Action.

The Federal Council of Churches proposes to make this an annual observance, designating for the purpose the week beginning with the third Sunday in January of each year.

—Clifford Earle.

CITIZENSHIP

THE 81ST CONGRESS

On January 3, a new Congress takes over on Capitol Hill in Washington. The question facing serious-minded Christians is, What may we expect from this Congress? Without attempting to gaze into the crystal ball we can be rather sure of certain legislation.

In the International Field

1. Collective Defense Pacts. The Vandenberg Resolution (S. Res. 239),

passed by the 80th Congress, opened the way for further United States participation in such pacts under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Rio Treaty and Brussels Pact

"The Rio Treaty of October, 1947, translates into practical form the principle agreed upon in the wartime Act of Chapultepec (1945)—that the American republics should together guarantee the political independence and territorial integrity of each of them. Under this Treaty, the United States and the Latin American na-

tions have agreed that an armed attack against one of them is an attack against all. Each is pledged to assist in meeting such an attack, and to consult with the others on what action should be taken.

"Consultation takes place through a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, where decisions are made by a two-thirds vote. There is the important reservation, however, that a nation voting against military action need not take part in it. Thus the United States has not given up veto power over the use of its own forces—although the United States may be required to use economic embargoes or cut off diplomatic relations against its will.

"The Brussels Pact of March, 1948, binds Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg to give 'all the military and other aid and assistance in their power' if any of them should be the victim of an armed attack in Europe. The Pact also provides for increased economic and political co-operation. Since no voting provisions are mentioned, decisions are made unanimously. The text makes clear, however, that aid is to be given automatically if an attack occurs.

Other Regional Arrangements

"The League of Arab States is likewise an example of a regional arrangement permitted under the U N Charter. Still others may develop. The nations of Southeast Asia form a natural geographic bloc, as do the Scandinavian countries. The Soviet Union has negotiated a network of bilateral defense agreements with her neighbors, and it is possible that a regional pact might emerge in eastern Europe.

North Atlantic Pact?

"Various plans for defense pacts and military aid to Europe are known to be under consideration in Washington. A North Atlantic Pact with the United States and Canada has been proposed by the Five Brussels Pact countries. Canada has already announced her interest in negotiating such a pact. The Executive Branch of the United States Government,

which has been holding conversations with the nations concerned, is now conferring with leaders of the newly elected Congress and drafting proposals for legislation.

Should United States Support Defense Pacts?

"Those who favor defense pacts argue that they would strengthen the United Nations by providing a measure of collective security even though limited. Such pacts would put into effect, for the nations signing them, the guarantee of aid against aggression which the United Nations itself is not yet able to provide. By pooling their strength, all members would become stronger. The pacts could deter aggressors looking for an easy victory, by making a clear advance commitment to aid a country when attacked. Many people believe that such a commitment might have stopped Hitler and prevented World War II.

"The main argument made against defense pacts is that they would weaken the United Nations and increase the chances of war. While such pacts are permitted under the Charter, they are in a way a last resort when the Charter fails to work. There is a grave danger that they would take precedence over the United Nations, rather than being subordinate to it. The pacts would probably be considered by Russia as military alliances against her and widen the gulf between East and West. In this way they might lessen the chances of ever setting up a universal security system under the United Nations. Other nations would be forced to choose sides and the U N might splinter into armed camps.

"Any defense pact signed by the United States commits us to possible military action, although an actual declaration of war is still up to the Congress. Our ability to take on such commitments must be weighed against our military strength and our existing obligations. These include the Rio Treaty for common defense of the Western Hemisphere; occupation responsi-

bilities in Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea; and our military missions in Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Philippines, and China.

Regional or General Pacts?

"If the United States chooses to support defense pacts, a second major question arises: Should we put our influence behind a general pact, open to all nations, or behind a more limited regional pact?"

"A general pact, being open to all, would, it is argued, be more in the spirit of the U N Charter, and less apt to be considered an alliance against any one nation. Nor would it have the bad psychological effect of excluding nations that wish to join. Asiatic countries, for example, have already complained that the interests of the United States are too largely in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe. A regional pact with Europe would add to this grievance.

"If the Soviet Union should not join such a general pact, however (and she would be most unlikely to do so), it might be considered a world alliance against Russia and might split the United Nations even more seriously than regional pacts.

"Some favor a more limited pact with a group of European nations. Rather than committing itself to military action anywhere in the world, the United States would concentrate its strength in backing up the nations most vital to our national security—just as we are doing economically in the European Recovery Program.

"Such a pact would probably begin with the U.S.A., Canada, and the five Brussels Pact countries. It might well include other European nations, such as Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Portugal."

2. Increased Military Aid. "Another question facing the United States is military aid for Europe, to supplement economic aid and give strength to the proposed defense pacts. Some such plan is scheduled to come before Congress. What it would

entail—how much money and what type of aid—has not yet been made public. It would probably involve U. S. military missions to the countries concerned, standardizing of arms and equipment, joint military planning, and the pooling of capacities for common defense as well as the shipment of arms. Estimates of the yearly cost have ranged from \$2 billion to \$5 billion.

"A program of foreign military aid, plus our own national rearmament, would substantially increase the U. S. budget. If it should become very extensive, such a program might force the United States to go on a wartime basis, and require strict regulation of our economy. Is the U. S. willing to pay this price?"

"Military aid must also be considered in relation to European recovery. The nations participating in ERP need political stability and military security. Yet a heavy rearmament program might seriously hinder recovery by diverting manpower, materials, and machines for defense purposes. At the same time, such a program might defeat its very purpose of making western Europe more secure; for unless economic conditions improve, several of these countries will be ripe for Communist expansion. And would Congress continue to pass adequate appropriations for ERP if faced with heavy military demands?"

Just how much we can afford to spend as a nation for military aid in the light of our economic commitments and the domestic program indicated below is a grave question with all economists. There seems to be substantial agreement that \$15 billion is the limit, and that is the amount being spent in this current year. (See November, 1948, issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS.)

3. Universal Military Training. We can expect a new bill to be introduced. It is likely to be similar in content to those in the 80th Congress.

4. Funds for Economic Recovery Program. Government officials are work-

ing on estimates now and the amount will be announced shortly.

civil war. We can expect much discussion of this subject.

5. International Children's Fund. The United States has revised its stand on the United Nations Appeal for Children and is again agreeing to co-operate. Will Congress take the next step and appropriate the full 100 million dollars needed as our Government's share of the International Children's Fund?

6. International Trade. The International Trade Organization treaty will be up for ratification of our Senate. The details of this are very important in world economic recovery.

7. Reciprocal Trade Agreements. Congress will be asked to pass enabling legislation for trade agreements similar to those in force during past years, but without the restrictions of the bill passed in the 80th Congress.

8. International Wheat Treaty. Information on this has been carried in the last two issues of SOCIAL PROGRESS. The only change is that United States farmers will now be guaranteed \$1.75 per ton instead of \$2.00 as in the previous treaty which the 80th Congress failed to ratify.

9. Displaced Persons. A new bill to strengthen the present act will be introduced early in the session, but seems to have little likelihood of passage unless church and citizen groups work hard for it.

10. China. What will be done toward helping China is anybody's guess at this writing. The State Department seems not to be interested in further intervention. Many citizens feel just as they felt about Greece—that further military aid must be given to stop Communism. Another large group of citizens believe that the United States should get out of China completely and immediately and let her settle her own

In the Domestic Field

1. Prices. There will be some adjustments on prices. It seems more likely that this will be in relation to taxes and allotments rather than in terms of rationing and consumer controls.

2. Housing. A new housing bill can be expected. It will be an over-all housing program and will be a stronger bill than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill. It will include public housing and rural housing.

3. Social Security. Grants to the aged will be increased (present average \$25.17 monthly); coverage will be extended to more workers; and the formula for granting Social Security liberalized, probably the minimum coverage will be raised from \$3,000 to \$4,800 with 100 per cent increase in grants to the aged.

4. Civil Rights. At last the Senate rules on filibuster may be changed. A law to prevent discrimination in employment (FEPC) will be pushed and probably ahead of the other bills in the civil rights package.

5. Labor Legislation. The minimum wage will probably be increased to 75 cents hourly. What will happen to the Taft-Hartley Act is not clear at this time, but we expect some changes.

As usual, SOCIAL PROGRESS will carry a monthly summary of current bills in which the Church has an interest. In preparation for your citizenship responsibility toward the 81st Congress, now is the time to re-read *Christian Social Action*, the 1948 report of the Standing Committee on Social Education and Action of the General Assembly. Your minister has this report, or you can get your own copy, free, by writing the Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Sanctuary

Search and Discovery

Call to Worship:

"Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."—*Isa. 55: 6, 7.*

Hymn: "Holy! Holy! Holy! Lord God Almighty!"

Invocation:

Almighty God our Father, who dost draw us to thyself with cords of love, help us now to give full and free response to thy call. Above the tumult of our time, may we hear thy voice speaking words of peace unto our souls. Give to us as we worship the singleness of mind and gentleness of heart which shall receive with gratitude and joy the blessings thou dost impart. Make us more eager to know thy truth, and more ready to obey thy will, and help us so to join hands and hearts in the fellowship of thy Church that we shall move forward in new unity toward the day of thy Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Scripture: Matthew 7: 1-20.

Meditation:

One of the most valuable of Jesus' promises is his assurance that man's search will result in discovery. He says, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." These are the two parts of religious experience. They must be fitted together or faith is not healthy and valid. As the heart of man is filled with longing for the presence of God, so he is granted that which he desires. We are always seeking and we are always finding too.

Either one of these alone leads to self-satisfaction and pride. Discovery makes men arrogant regarding the treasure they have found. Constant search results in smugness and superiority to those who possess convictions. The problem is to continue the search even as one holds fast to what has been found.

Hymn: "I Sought the Lord."

Meditation: The Search.

All of us are pilgrims like Abraham, looking "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." This common yearning binds men together, and it is well to be reminded when surface annoyances divide us of how much alike we are in our common hunger for certainty and for God.

This universal seeking, however, can quite easily be diverted. Men remain on the

search but for different and lesser things. They have a wistful longing, but it is for a better position, a higher salary, a larger and more comfortable home. Christ bids men search for the true goals of life, knowing that until they are sought our spirits will be continually dissatisfied. Instead of seeking things that endure, many people are willing to settle for the messes of pottage which a materially minded and comfort-loving civilization is able to bestow.

Yet seeking can be a satisfaction instead of a distress if it is aimed toward the appropriate goal. The richest and most joyous lives we know are those that are searching most truly for God. The beauty of the goal is reflected down upon the path and a radiance shines upon the seeker who, although still a long way off, has his feet upon the right way.

Period of Silent Prayer.

Meditation: The Discovery.

Our world is eager to yield up its secrets to those who seek them. Man thinks he must beat down the opposition, must smash his way to a conquest of nature. Yet whenever a discovery is made in any field of thought or life it seems that something which had long been imprisoned springs forth, grateful to be released. God is self-revealing and so is his universe, ever eager to show men the nature and meaning of life. We are to move into new areas of discovery. With all humility in the presence of those who have been the discoverers in the realm of physical science, we know that the discoveries to be made in the field of social science are even more difficult. How the world will rejoice when at last some seeker comes upon the cure for cancer! As hard as this will be, it is vastly easier than the discovery of the way by which the world may be cured of its prejudice. And as hard as that will be, it will be harder still to find the way by which man's willful spirit may be made completely submissive to the will of God. But we know that once we move out upon the search, eager to find the deeper and richer life with God, that will happen to us which happened to a returning prodigal who found that "when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." Begin the search; the discovery will come. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." What a field for new discovery lies before us!

Period of Silent Prayer.

Hymn: "O What Their Joy and Their Glory Must Be."

Prayer:

"Eternal and ever-blessed God, who art the author of our life, and the end of our pilgrimage; we beseech Thee so to guide us by Thy Word and Spirit, amid all perils and temptations, that we may not wander from Thy way, nor stumble upon the dark mountains; but may finish our course in joy, and come to our eternal rest in Thee; through the saving grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."—*The Book of Common Worship*, Revised.

Benediction.

—Prepared by Phillips P. Elliott, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, New York.

About Books

Education in a Divided World, by James B. Conant. Harvard University Press, \$3.00.

In the world in which we live, too many of us see our personal and social headaches as a series of disembodied thorns. We seldom see them in terms of a living root and branch for which the thorns are incidental, though painful. And only rarely do we catch a vision of the bud that could blossom with our help.

It is typical of our American democracy that such an overview should come to us in terms of a central and unique institution of American life—our system of free public schools. In presenting the problems of our public schools to the nation's laymen, the president of Harvard University gives form to American ideals. As a result, his argument is as interesting for its general philosophy as for its specific recommendations regarding education.

He starts with the prediction that we shall live for some years to come in an armed truce, and then in a world divided by the conflict of Communism and democracy. What has a democracy, whose very life is diversity and individuality, to offer in answer to the neat, patterned "line" of Soviet philosophy? Have we nothing to offer our children but diversity for diversity's sake?

President Conant thinks we have—something good enough, if we work at it, to become an "exportable commodity" in a world searching for ideals to live by.

Basic—so basic that we forget all men do not share it—is our firm Hebraic-Christian belief in the sanctity of the individual. Americans will give many reasons for the things they do; "but whether

Protestant, Catholic or Jew, active church member or nonconformist, almost every American believes that human life is sacred." Associated with this idea are two others: the individual's obligation to other individuals, and "the need of our society for a high degree of personal liberty and at the same time active and sympathetic cooperation toward certain ends."

Given this firm foundation for a common creed, we can then list the goals we strive to reach. Not all Americans would agree with all of President Conant's goals, but most certainly could. His goals for America are six: 1. Continuation of a government based on free elections and free expression of opinion. 2. Continuation of many relatively independent government units (towns, cities, states, and Federal government) with a maximum of "home rule." 3. A much greater degree of honesty and efficiency in government. 4. Continuation of a highly competitive economic system with its wide divergence of rewards in money. 5. A greater degree of social mobility and fluidity and a lesser degree of social distinction between people in different jobs and kinds of work. 6. A greater degree of equality of opportunity for the youth of each succeeding generation.

It is President Conant's concern to foster this equal chance for all youths that leads him to consider the state of public education today. "As a nation," he reports, "we are a long, long way from equality of educational opportunity." Not only does family income affect a child's schooling, but also the location of his home. And education in America is becoming more and more the door—whether open or closed—to life.

In grappling with this large problem,

President Conant brings forth a series of specific proposals of interest to every American. These proposals have to do both with how we are to finance the spreading of better education to all and what shall be taught in the basic institution of American life—our free public schools.

—*William M. Pinkerton.*

The Reconstruction of Humanity,
by Pitirim A. Sorokin. The Beacon Press.
\$3.00.

When Professor Sorokin publishes a new book, readers have learned to expect a careful study of the cultural problems of mankind, interpreted by a deep insight. In his latest book, the Harvard sociologist analyzes the plans being proposed for the deliverance of man from the deathtrap into which he has maneuvered himself. Declaring these plans to be inadequate and fallacious, the author then sets forth his own "constructive blueprint" for delivering man from war and destruction.

Everyone who is relying on one of the current plans for preventing war should read the criticism of "quack cures for war and impotent plans for peace," which forms the first part of the book. Those who believe that war can be prevented by political cures, such as the spread of democracy, or the United Nations, or a world government, may resent their plans being called "quack cures," but they will be helped by this criticism. The same may be said for those who place their trust in economic, scientific, educational, and even religious cures. The principal defect in all current plans "is that they either neglect the decisive factor of altruism and love, without which war cannot be eliminated, or are unable to make the overt behavior of persons and groups, with their social and cultural institutions, more altruistic than they are now."

Because there are pathological defects in the general nature of our contemporary culture, fundamental changes are required. The major premise of our culture, that

"the true reality value is sensory and that there is no supersensory reality value," must be replaced by a more valid premise. Our materialistic, hedonistic, and utilitarian culture, which degrades our values and the "value of man himself to the level of mere sensory material things," must give way to a sense of values that recognizes the supersensory. A creative altruistic order must be established, such as is found in the Sermon on the Mount. Only by changing the whole of our culture—not merely some segment of it—can peace be secured. "If we wish to eliminate wars and establish a creative altruistic order, we must modify simultaneously our culture, our social institutions, and the personality of our citizenry in an altruistic direction." The author discusses what changes are necessary in our cultural and social institutions, throughout our society.

Professor Sorokin is hopeful that such an altruistic order can be achieved and war thereby eliminated. This cannot be achieved by force, but must come from a transformation carried on simultaneously on the personal, cultural, and social levels.

The importance of this book lies in its penetrating criticism of Western culture and the impotence of current plans for mankind's deliverance; in its insistence that man and his institutions must be transformed from within, and that this transformation must affect the whole of our culture. When the author considers how this transformation is to be wrought, however, one feels that he lacks an adequate realism about the power of sin in man and the power necessary to free man from sin. His enthusiasm for Yoga and the spiritual exercises of Loyola are not likely to have a wide appeal nor to be a transforming power in Western culture. The analysis of the sickness of our culture and of man's desperate need is excellent, but this reviewer, at least, wishes the author had expressed a clearer appreciation and understanding of the Christian faith.

—*Earl W. Crawford.*

The Big Fisherman, by Lloyd C. Douglas. Houghton Mifflin Company. \$3.75.

In days when the Arabians and Jews are in real battle this novel with its background of the ancient feud between these two peoples is of especial interest. From the first chapter with its story of the mistreatment of Ishmael, the father of the Arabians, by Abraham, the father of the Jews, to the closing chapter with its story of the death of Peter the reader is aware of this feud.

Peter, the big fisherman, is the central figure of the novel. We meet him on the shores of Galilee as the boss of a fishing crew. We follow him as he is changed from an illiterate, irreligious, and beligerent businessman into a fearless martyr in the cause of his Master. Fara provides the love interest in the book. She is the daughter of Herod and Arnon, an Arabian princess, who came from Arabia to Judea filled with hate, but forgets her errand of vengeance and finds a new freedom in service.

This is the eleventh novel by Lloyd Douglas and is one of his best. Jesus is one of the characters, and the author gives us a new portrayal as working at his trade of carpentry even in the midst of his ministry. His moving power in healing and teaching is felt whenever he is present. The five hundred and eighty pages are well worth reading for enjoyment and enlightenment.

—Anne Earle.

New Pamphlets

Two new pamphlets published by the League of Women Voters should be required reading for every Social Education and Action Committee:

The Citizen and the United Nations answers simply and directly the questions many people are asking today.

The 40 Billion Dollar Question—What Does the Government Budget Mean to the Citizen?—explains the relation of Government receipts to expenses and the problem of reducing Government spending and what the citizen can do through his elected representatives to determine how Government money is spent.

Order from League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. 15 cents each.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"Coalition for Peace" is condensed by permission from the October, 1948, issue of *Foreign Affairs*.

Quoted paragraphs in the "Citizenship" section of "Christian Action" are reprinted with permission from *Brief for Action*, League of Women Voters.

Portions of "It Is for Humanity to Decide" are taken from Pitirim A. Sorokin's book *The Reconstruction of Humanity*, published by The Beacon Press. Used with permission.

Photograph of conference leaders, appearing on page 9, by Acme Newspictures.

UN's Economic and Social Accomplishments in Three Short Years

The United Nations is still our greatest hope for solving world economic, political, and social problems, for achieving a warless world. Though newspaper headlines proclaim only its failures, thoughtful Americans need to know what the United Nations has accomplished, despite almost insurmountable obstacles and endless procedural difficulties.

Aviation. The International Civil Aeronautics Organization has instituted international agreements regulating air communications, radio aids to navigation, air traffic control, rules of the air, etc. It maintains thirteen weather observation stations at strategic points in the North Atlantic.

Food. The Food and Agriculture Organization issues the International World Food Appraisal quarterly. It estimates world food needs, allocates short supplies, and compiles and distributes technical data on refrigeration, storage, production, distribution, etc., of foods.

Education. UNESCO is investigating the psychological causes of war, providing for minimum education of backward peoples, compiling and distributing data on the educational needs of war-devastated countries, providing international fellowships, and arranging exchanges of teachers.

Banking and Business. The International Bank and the International Monetary Fund have 14 billion dollars' worth of resources. Each one has lent over \$500 million for reconstruction purposes, development of economic activity and currency stabilization. Twenty-two nations have put into effect the provisions of the 1947, UN negotiated, Geneva Trade Agreements, the most comprehensive tariff-reduction agreement in history.

Drugs. The Narcotics Commission regulates the international distribution and use of narcotic drugs and has brought new, habit-forming, synthetic drugs like amidone under its control.

Electricity. The Electric Power Committee for Europe is establishing electric power lines to carry standardized current across national boundaries.

Medicine. In 1947 the World Health Organization stemmed the cholera epidemic in Egypt. It is now providing treatment for tuberculosis, venereal disease, and malaria, especially in areas where these diseases materially undermine production.

(Continued on outside back cover)

UN's Accomplishments (*Continued*)

Labor. Representatives of labor, management, and government got together through the International Labor Organization to draw up over eighty internationally adopted conventions concerning labor standards.

Transportation. The Economic Commission for Europe has standardized freight-car rentals throughout Europe and established free transit across national frontiers for commercial trucks for the first time in history.

Libraries. UNESCO is translating the world's classics into almost every language and is arranging for their international distribution. It is securing adoption of a standardized international cataloguing system.

Press. The UN Conference on Freedom of Information, 1948, adopted agreements providing equal access to transmission facilities, freest possible access to all news, and freedom to transmit information and opinions across frontiers without Government interference.

Communications. The International Telecommunications Union apportions wave-length frequencies among nations for radio, and secures international agreements as to the use of telephone lines and underseas cables.

Post Office. The Universal Postal Union provides unviolated delivery of private mail throughout the world at lowest possible rates.

Women's Rights. The UN prevents international trade in white slaves and the Commission on the Status of Women safeguards women's rights in the political economic, civil, social, and educational field by international agreement.

Timber. The International Timber Conference, 1947, unanimously agreed on a program to alleviate Europe's acute timber shortage.

Coal and Steel. The Economic Commission for Europe establishes priorities for coal distribution with the result that in the first quarter of 1948 France's steel output has been stepped up by a rate of one million tons yearly, Belgium and Luxembourg by one-fourth million tons each.

and many other



accomplishments